	_		
1	SCOPING AND INFORMATIONAL MEETING		
2	STACY - APRIL 30, 2015 - 6:00 P.M.		
3	BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION		
4	AND DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE		
5			
6	In the Matter of the Combined Application of North Star		
7	Solar PV LLC For a Site Permit for and Route Permit for		
8	the North Star Solar Electric Power Generating Plant and		
9	Associated 115 kV High-Voltage Transmission Line in		
L0	Chisago County, Minnesota		
L1			
L2			
L3	MPUC DOCKET NO. IP-6943/GS-15-33		
L4			
L5			
L6			
L7	Lent Town Hall 33155 Hemingway Avenue		
L8	Stacy, Minnesota 55079		
L9			
20			
21			
22	April 30, 2015		
23			
24			
25			

		2
1	INDEX	
2	PUBLIC SPEAKER	PAGE
3	PATRICE SANG	3
4	TOM HOCH	9
5	DEAN MANDEL	11
6	DONNA JOHNSON	14
7	MARK KORAN	19
8	PHIL CARLSON	24
9	JESSE KOHLER	27
10	GWENDALYN SWENSON	30
11	DENNIS ANDERSON	31
12	RICHARD DANIELS	36
13	VICKI KACZMARCZYK	38
14	KRISTINE ANDERSON	39
15	KORY ABELL	53
16	JUSTIN BAKER	56
17	MINDA NELSON	61
18	DOUG MELBY	68
19	TOM HOCH	69
20	JOHN WALTER	70
21	PETER WAHLSTROM	71
22	DON BUTTON	75
23	BRAD HUNTER	75
24	MICHAEL MADDEN	76
25	BRAD HUNTER	79

MS. SMETANA: Okay. So you can see that David put up some sort of ground rules, if you will, for the public comment portion. Again, please be sure to state and spell your name for the court reporter. We want to make sure we have an accurate record. And we do need to have one speaker at a time. She can't record what two people are saying at the same time.

So the first person is Richard Daniels.

If you could please come forward, hopefully this mike is going to work for you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: He had to leave.

MS. SMETANA: Oh, he had to leave. Okay. Very good.

Next is Patrice Sang.

MS. SANG: A few comments I guess. You had said, Tracy, that the State is neutral and that the agencies are neutral, and yet I also heard that the State's required to have a certain percentage of solar plants as well. And there were a few site alternatives, is what was mentioned by the Minnesota Department of Commerce. And so would that place some of the --

MS. SMETANA: Excuse me. Can you move the mike just a little bit closer? Thank you.

MS. SANG: -- so would that place some of the representation of the citizens at risk based on a possible conflict of interest with the forces that be of the required solar part and not having alternative options?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: This is going to be difficult, but we are in a situation that the State Legislature has made a policy decision. So the state is bound to the 1.5 percent participation of solar energy, of retail sales of electricity in Minnesota. So to do that, we have to have solar farms. And that adds up to a lot. There's a lot of electricity.

Now, I want to make clear that I'm not saying we can't have alternatives. There are a lot of alternatives on the table across the state.

For this project we're building up and down. And if this is indeed to your question, if there are alternatives you want to make, my restriction was that we have to make sure that they fit the other things that are at play in this project, which is there have to be land rights, there has to be available access to sun energy and there has to be availability of connection to the transmission.

If that's what you meant by not being allowed alternatives, you can make alternatives, and by all means do, but it's not like saying this could be better over here in this county instead of Chisago. It may be that the Commission decides that in the end, after hearings, after all the information. So, no, I don't mean to suggest that you can't make alternatives. I'm just saying what the restrictions are for the environmental review.

MS. SANG: And I guess my comment was more towards the state protecting the rights and well-being of residents versus the pressure of the state being required to have the solar part. That's the concern I had. And I guess hearing that tonight, that kind of goes into weighing the risks and the benefits of the projects that would be initiated and with an objective that should be positive outcomes for our Minnesota citizens and the citizens that, you know, the agency represents.

And in three key areas, I'll go through them quickly, I just have a few general questions today. On the area of health, which is real important for all of us, does the importance of public health and safety in Minnesota only apply to high population density?

1 MR. BIRKHOLZ: No.

MS. SANG: Or does it apply to low density population, as well, then?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: Yes. We have to determine what we might consider a public health risk and what may mitigate that. Those are the kinds of questions that are on the table and that's what the Board is to determine. We've got to define the parameters of the question and the answer that's being asked.

MS. SANG: And that comment is relative to page 70 in the docket. There's like a 95-page docket on the PUC that specifically mentioned that it did not -- public health and safety was not affected because it was not a high population density. That's why I'm asking that question.

The next one is would you -- What would you -- I guess what would be your acceptable level of increase in health risk to the citizens of Minnesota as it pertains to this project and the other solar projects, as well, and the levels of EMF?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: Not our -- And this is serious, totally serious, not our decision to make.

That is -- All the final decisions on permitting and conditions are -- rest in the hands of the Public

Utilities Commission. Our job is to find out all they are. Are there going to be EMF issues. If there are EMF issues, what do we know about them to date, what can we find out about them. Those public health issues, if they are public health issues, that's the information we want to compile so that when the Public Utilities Commission makes its decision, it has as much good information available as possible.

MS. SANG: So, in other words, that should be a question asked to the Public Utilities Commission?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: And that would be a public -- that will be a question you could certainly ask at the public hearing, before the Judge. And by that time you'll have the environmental assessment and you'll see what kind of answers it's provided. And if it hasn't provided answers satisfactory to you, then you should be bringing them up to the Judge at that time.

MS. SANG: And then would you agree that a home is the largest investment for families within the U.S. -- within Minnesota?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: I'm not going to --

MS. SANG: Well, most often it is. So

what is the short-term and long-term projected decrease in the value of homeowners' property adjacent to this project?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: Excellent question, and we don't know yet, really, honestly. Like I told you right at the outset, we're not coming in here with a bunch of questions and a preconceived idea that we're going to lay down for you. We're here to find out what questions you have. You're asking questions that we want to know. So we don't have all the answers to start with.

MS. SANG: And the key -- I'm just -- I want to get on health and socioeconomics because these are factors that will greatly affect our families.

On the environment, as well, you had mentioned earlier that you will be doing a review of the environmental factors, not just the -- the climate, the culture, our neighborhood, how they will be affected, not so much focusing only in one area of environment, but really looking at the whole boat, the whole picture, correct?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: Right. And in that draft you can see that each of those is part of it, socioeconomic and public health and all the natural

environmental issues. In the end, if they're not listed, the ones that you bring to the table.

MS. SANG: Those are the only questions that I have for today. Thanks.

MS. SMETANA: Next on the list is Michael Madden.

MR. MADDEN: I pass for now.

MS. SMETANA: Okay. Thank you.

Tom Hoch.

MR. HOCH: Tom Hoch, H-O-C-H. Can I submit something?

MS. SMETANA: Yes.

MR. HOCH: That's for you. And I have two others I'd like to pass out for the audience, if I can, one on each side, I would guess.

MS. SMETANA: Sure.

MR. HOCH: I'm just going to pass those out, start with that. That was a map that I took out of PUC's website, 15-33 docket. That shows the section that I live in, which is surrounded by 800 acres. And where it is on that map is the project location, they have scratched us off in the center, like with a pencil. The first time I saw that I almost cried. We're just being scraped off the earth and I took exception for that.

I'm one of seven families located in the center of this project. I'm concerned for the health of my family. To my knowledge, there's not a solar farm in the nation that has families living in the center surrounded by 400,000 solar panels. I do not want my family to be guinea pigs so some out-of-state company can profit with the taxes I pay that will support this project.

I would ask the Commission to do a detailed study of EES units and voltage surge. We are being placed in the center of an electrical field with 50 inverters that have been proven to be unsafe. In good conscience I will not be able to have my young grandchildren visit me for fear it would cause them problems later in life with their health.

The environmental studies should include the environment of the homeowners if we have to stay. I did not move here ten years ago to be surrounded by solar panels and an eight-foot high chain link fence. It would be like living in a prison. I would like to submit the North Star map. I did that at the beginning. Sorry. According to that map, we don't exist.

I have many more concerns, but I will let

1 other members address them. Thank you for your attention. 2 3 MS. SMETANA: Did you want to hand the written comments in? 4 5 MR. HOCH: Yeah. I have extra ones. Thank you. 6 7 MS. SMETANA: Next is Dean Mandel. 8 MR. MANDEL: Dean, D-E-A-N, last name 9 Mandel, M-A-N-D-E-L. I'll try to keep it brief. Ι 10 appreciate the opportunity to not only present information today, but --11 12 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Louder. 13 MR. MANDEL: I appreciate the opportunity tonight to share verbally some information and 14 15 obviously to be able to follow up in terms of information. 16 Simply put, I think as lay people and 17 18 residents, there's a perception that solar energy is green and perceived as free, simple, safe. 19 It's aesthetically pleasing. 20 21 In reality, what the proposal by North 22 Star Energy fails to share is that there is also EMF 23 energy which is being radiated and which has not 24 been shared fully in the proposal or to the

Department of Commerce or, specifically, to the PUC.

It goes back to the importance of public health and safety.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We can talk all we want about how silent solar energy is or the view of our property or the chain link fence or the barbed wire. What I just want to throw out to the group tonight is that within the proposal by North Star Energy, the engineers also decided to become scientists and the scientists became medical experts when it comes to WHO documentation, which stands for the World Health Organization. This ties back to the importance of these electromagnetic forces or fields.

And I know that the Minnesota Department of Commerce and the PUC actually have been involved in this back in 2002. There's actually a white paper that has been stated that goes through -- And it's a Minnesota state interagency working group on EMF issues. This white paper, back in 2002, stated very clearly that they concluded that the current body of evidence is insufficient to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between EMF waves or radiation and adverse healthy effects, even though at that time the documentation was very clear in certain clinical studies that showed that EMF correlates to carcinogens, or cancer. The medical

specialist that this particular working group used was the Minnesota Department of Health.

While they happen to be experts in many areas of public health, they are not necessarily the world's experts in EMF. Those happen to be the World Health Organization, who in 2007 said exactly that, that EMF correlates to an increase in exposure and an increased health risk to the public correlates to carcinogens. I believe that this information is being overlooked. I believe that it's important to bring that up, as the residents and some homes are being purchased but others are not.

We talked about a marketing program for solar energy company of being a good neighbor, and yet many neighbors are being excluded in that process.

The reason I wanted to share that today is because in looking at the Department of Commerce information, he said that the Number 1 factor for environmental assessment is to avoid exposure. The best way to avoid exposure is not to put that solar program in a residential area, where the leading experts in the world -- where the leading experts in the world, not the Minnesota Department of Health,

have shown very clearly as a task force that there is a public health concern.

I'll leave it at that. I'll share my information in writing. Would it be appropriate to send it to the Department of Commerce or specifically to the PUC?

MS. SMETANA: At this stage, for the environmental assessment, it should go to Mr. Birkholz of the Department of Commerce. Thank you.

MR. MANDEL: Thank you very much.

MS. SMETANA: Next is Donna Johnson.

MS. JOHNSON: D-O-N-N-A, J-O-H-N-S-O-N.

Since the speaker system is very poor in this building and I didn't hear most of everything that was being said, if somebody has said something that I didn't get, please bear with me.

I guess my first question is, the investment is \$180 million. Where is this coming from? How much is coming from the federal government, the state government and the county, if any?

MR. WHITNEY: The \$180 million is a private investment. The project does benefit from a 30 percent investment tax credit being offered by

the federal government through the end of next year. 1 And to my knowledge, there's no direct benefit from 2 3 the state. The project will pay approximately \$350,000 in property tax. The vast majority of that 4 5 resides locally, to the county and the township and the cities. 6 7 MS. JOHNSON: So there's no money coming from the federal government here for subsidiaries or 8 9 -- It's all private; is that what you said? 10 Unknown SPEAKER: I'm sorry. quite hear. The speaker system is bad. 11 12 MR. WHITNEY: Yes, the \$180 million is a 13 private investment. The project does benefit from a 30 percent investment tax credit offered by the 14 15 federal government through the end of 2016. 16 MS. JOHNSON: So what happens after 2016 if that does not continue? 17 18 MR. WHITNEY: We expect the project to be operational by the end of 2016 and capture that 19 value. What the industry does after the change, I 20 do not know. 21 22 MS. JOHNSON: So you can't tell me it 23 would be profitable after 2016; am I correct of 24 that?

MR. WHITNEY:

The project was proposed to

Xcel assuming the capture of the government tax credit.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. The next question I have, how much -- how much study have you done with the solar panels in this part of the country to see if they're cost-effective? Because, you know, everybody that lives here, if you go out in the middle of the winter, when it's 20 below and it's cloudy, tell me how those panels are going to be working effectively. I can understand in the summertime, but I can't understand the wintertime.

MR. WHITNEY: The expected production of the project, as presented and proposed to Xcel, helped basic -- helped the project determine the power price that was necessary. The project was selected out of 111 projects, and this is one of three most cost-competitive, most cost-effective projects. So this represents some of the most cost-effective solar available in the United States.

MS. JOHNSON: But have you ever studied it in Minnesota to find out? I mean, how many panels have you put and studied in Minnesota?

MR. WHITNEY: The expected generation from the project is site specific.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. Because this is

interesting. We're snowbirds and we go down to New Mexico for our winter. And in November there was an article in the Las Cruces paper and it came from California and from Los Angeles. And I'll just kind of read this over so everybody can understand what I'm talking about.

The largest solar power plant of this type in the world, once promoted as the turning point in green energy, isn't producing as much energy as planned. One of the reasons is as basic as it gets: The sun isn't shining as much as expected.

Sprawling across roughly five square miles of federal desert near the California-Nevada border of the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System opened in February, with operators saying it would produce enough electricity to power a city of 140,000 homes. So far, however, the plant is producing about half of its expected annual output for 2014, according to calculations by the California Energy Commission, and it goes on and talks about. This is what I'm concerned about.

Now -- And this solar plant was in Primm,
Nevada. And if anybody knows where Primm, Nevada
is, it's right on the border between Nevada and

California on Interstate 15, and it gets plenty of sun and heat. So if they can't produce enough, how can a solar farm here in the state in the middle of winter produce enough electricity to generate so it's cost-effective?

MR. WHITNEY: We expect the North Star project to generate 204,000 megawatt hours of electricity a year. I think that's substantiated if you read the Aurora document, which is a 100 megawatt solar project using the same technology. They anticipate generating almost exactly the same amount of electricity.

The data that we used to derive that generation is from a national, well-known energy lab, and they use long-term meteorological data. All over the country we have sites very close by that were used to ground that estimate.

> MS. JOHNSON: Where were the sites?

MR. WHITNEY: One of them was the Minneapolis-St. Paul airport.

> MS. JOHNSON: Okay.

MS. SMETANA: Next is Joyce Goodson.

MS. GOODSON: Pass.

MS. SMETANA: Then we will move on to

25 Mark Koran.

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

MR. KORAN: Hello, everyone. Again, I'm Mark Koran, K-O-R-A-N. I'm also a resident and a member of the Lent Township Planning and Zoning Commission as well.

I just have a few comments, and I think it reflects the majority of one of the reasons that people are here today and the concerns people have.

This is an impact -- Or I guess it's a significant impact to our rural quality of life and the reason most people are here. The primary reason most people are here and I think the consideration of the PUC should be to retain our total rural quality of life and improve it or protect it in every way, shape or form you can, with special consideration for those that are directly impacted and those that are sharing property lines.

And as you heard stories already this evening, there are people that are surrounded by it and I call them severely impacted. Most people of Minnesota in the farming communities, for all the reasons that they moved here, to enjoy a high quality of life, farm life, you know, there's seasons. There's more than just construction and winter in Minnesota. There's also farming season, harvesting and planting, harvesting, growing, those

are all aspects of the quality of life people expect when they walk out the front door in this community.

On top of that, wildlife, a significant benefit of moving and living in this community. And all of these things are at great risk when you look at the size and the scope of this project proposed.

Unfortunately, as we've learned, we're always a couple years behind, as residents, from the legislation that creates these opportunities. So we have huge concerns about how are those things going to affect us. Why should one community have this significant size and scope of project embedded within our backyard.

I think some of the suggestions that we would pose to the PUC and everybody involved from a permitting perspective is that we think the developer should take special consideration for screening in every way, shape and form to minimize any negative impacts not just on those residents that share a border with these properties or with the development, but also the transportation corridors.

We live in a scenic byway. The St. Croix
River byway is a part of this community. A huge
section of our community is wildlife preserves and

state land. It's the sole reason people are here.

Many of the local planning and zoning boards we've set aside and looked at some reasonable standards for screening. We would expect that the PUC, even though the energy companies have enabling legislation that allows them to bypass the planning and zoning, we would expect and require that the PUC require them to follow zoning planning and zoning ordinances as it relates to screening, and not just minimal screening.

We do think that this legislation, I think everybody who tracks it, this proposed legislation I think some of the southern solar farms, to have offsets or buffer zones and setbacks of 400 feet. I think that seems reasonable for anybody who has a resident or property abutting one of these facilities.

I think a special consideration should be taken for those significantly impacted, those that share more than one property line with the project of this size. I think significant compensation or requires compensation for the significant loss in value and the quality of their life. When they walk out the front door, they don't expect to see a vast array of industrialization of thousands of acres or

a thousand acres.

I think consideration of buyouts should be required for those that are willing to or in a position to. You know, buying out sounds like a great option. Many people don't have an option. We were a depressed economy. This area hasn't recovered. It's great from the developer's perspective because land values are so low, not so great for a homeowner, who's thrown into a position where they have to consider having to move, because this is their retirement home and their retirement community.

I think the people that moved here, you know, they had no expectation that this would occur, and we've been under attack for the last six, eight years.

I think those that are severely impacted, the minimum screening requirements for those that don't have the option to move or buy out should be dealt with not only by expanding the buffer zone or the setbacks, but to have significant screening to block the entire view of this array. I know it's impossible for a two-story home, but there are ways to dramatically improve that property. And when the size and scope of this project is \$180 million, it

would seem like a minimal cost to protect our residents and try to preserve the quality of life.

I think the other recommendations are, as we've tracked what's happened in the community within the state, we have an Aurora project which was also a 100 megawatt project distributed over 24 or 26 sites. I would recommend that no one community should bear a thousand plus acres of continuous solar farms. I think they should all be distributed. Let everybody share in the benefit of this great green solar energy that's been pushed upon us.

The only reason that these sites -- Or the only reason that these have proven or that we've talked about cost-effective projects out of the 111 that are proposed is because we've created a market that requires our energy producers and sellers to buy from them and the federal tax credits. If not, these discussions wouldn't even be occurring.

So I think the distributed sites are a great idea because I do think there are alternative sighting processes. I think the cost they can tack into. And much like the large solar garden projects, tack into or connect to all of the many substations and connectivity points in the grid all

over the state.

And, finally, I think the PUC should expand. I think the frustrated most people have here is these residents have been informed and notified. Most residents haven't. This affects the entire community, and I would expect that the PUC expand the notifications outside of the minimal requirements they adhere to today. These are large projects that affect a lot of people's quality of life not just in those that live directly adjacent to them, but those that commute through them as well.

We're typically two years behind in all the state and recommendations, so the residents feel that we're always on the last end and we have no voice. We're hoping that you take these considerations seriously and protect us for every -- and our real estate value and our total quality of life in every step you can. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Next is Phil Carlson.

MR. CARLSON: My name is Phil Carlson.

I'm a resident of Lynn Township and I'm also on the

Lynn Township Planning and Zoning.

And you need me to spell my name? P-H-I-L, C-A-R-L-S-O-N.

And I'm proposing a site consolidation, and it involves both the Aurora and the North Star project. As you know, we've already got the Aurora on the south end. I'm proposing that we reconfigure the layout of the North Star site. It would be advantageous to both Aurora and North Star because they would be able to have some joint synergies there as far as the substation for them.

Right now with the configuration they have in play, there's 45 homes that are negatively affected with visual pollution, so to speak, or possible health risks, whatever. And if you moved to the location that we're suggesting, these 45 homes would not longer be affected. Only one home would be negatively affected with this move, and that home, I think, is affected by one of the people that would be selling the additional land.

I believe that North Star would have preferred this move in the first place in this layout, but because Aurora already had this property under contract with options for their project, North Star was unable to approach those people.

And I think they would realize this is a better proposal, but they weren't able to. And now Aurora is in a position of trying to find something

to use the land for. And if you could find the project, we could consolidate those as well as other problem areas that Aurora is having with their permit as far as, for example, Wyoming.

If the Wyoming site was moved up here and put into this area, it would affect -- it would have a positive impact on 22 additional homes down in Wyoming with no impact to people up here because this is all out in a prairie, what they've referred to as a prairie. It's all open and it's all high ground. It's all built and it would reduce the perimeter of fencing required by three to four miles of fencing by combining this. It would also reduce the screening cost and they would be able to share a substation. Now, this is something they've got to work out, okay, but it could be easily done at this point.

And, actually, I used to be a facilitator when I worked for Cummings. And if they can't do it, I can work with both sides and get them to.

I'm pretty sure I could do that. So I guess -- Yeah, that's probably all the comments I have right now, as well as, you know, following local zoning ordinances is really important.

In the future these projects should be

more open. We were blind-sided by people coming and asking questions about flagging out in fields and tests being done on pilings or posts being driven in the ground, people ask me what's going on. Well, I had no idea what was going on and I'm on the planning commission. That's not right. I guess that's all I have for comments.

MS. SMETANA: Next is Jesse Kohler.

MR. KOHLER: I'm not a public speaker.

My name is Jesse, J-E-S-S-E, Kohler, K-O-H-L-E-R. I

work for Xcel Energy. And I'm a nobody there, but

I'm friends with a lot of people that are higher up.

And this project has been talk about for years and

we are now just getting notified of it. That, to

me, is wrong, okay.

Now, I have been doing some research on this stuff on the internet. The internet is the wonderful thing. From what I've been reading from people, is that they've been complaining about the loss of wildlife. Now, for me, I moved to where I live because of the farm field in my backyard. We have bear, we have turkeys, deer and squirrels. From what I understand, is once one of these solar fields go in, nobody even sees any squirrels anymore. For me that's fine, but the other wildlife

I'd like to see.

And what I've also heard is a lot of people complaining about the painful glares off solar panels that give them headaches.

And other people are complaining about the fences that go up because it looks to them like a prison fence. That, to me, I don't need in my backyard.

The farmland was a selling point for me.

I would like to know why we weren't notified sooner

of this.

And I've also done some research on this. I have an article right here all about solar panels. And this is from a realtor. It's all over the internet. It says, wow, these are some great articles about solar, solar panels and solar farms. Still digging I found one really negative problem: Property values decrease by 30 percent when your neighborhood has a solar panel farm nearby.

Okay. Since I got this letter in the mail from you guys, I have decided to put my house up for sale. I've lived there for almost ten years. I love my house. I love my neighbors. Guess what? All the realtors up in this area know about the solar field going in, okay.

I've had my house on the market for one month tomorrow. Guess what? I've had one showing, one. Do you know how bad that is? Houses are selling in six days or less. So you try to tell me that this thing is not going to depreciate our value. That would be a lie.

And I've also been finding out, too, on 367th Street -- If you guys aren't aware of where that is, it's right in my backyard pretty much -- that the solar company has been buying houses from these people. They're giving them fair market value and 20 percent on top of that. So I would like to get bought out or not have this thing come in my backyard, period.

So for your alternative, there's plenty of swampland down here in Carlos Avery. Go ahead and build it there, I don't care.

Otherwise, I also seen an article. It was just on KSTP news. There was a woman who paid a solar company \$16,000 to put solar panels on top of her roof. And her electricity bill, after eight years it will be 100 percent paid for with the solar panels on her house, and it will be \$2.61.

And also on my research I looked at solar fields and they only create about 10 percent of our

electricity. To me that's not enough. We have enough power plants and everything else around here.

We've got enough transmission lines.

And from my understanding also, and I don't know if this is true or not, but Xcel Energy wants to put transmission lines running over into Wisconsin out of this substation.

So I guess my last question is, is how is this going to benefit us. That's all I have.

MS. SMETANA: Gwendalyn Swenson.

MS. SWENSON: My name is Gwen Swenson,
G-W-E-N, S-W-E-N-S-O-N. I live in Sunrise Township.
I'm just down the road from the proposed solar site,
and I would like to speak in favor of the solar
farm. I believe I'd like to think that we're
forward thinking enough that we will look for
alternative energy, and this is a renewal source of
energy.

Also, we didn't want the power plant in our backyard because of the carbon emissions. There would be no carbon emissions with the solar farm.

Also, there would be low maintenance once it's built. There wouldn't be an increase in traffic on our roads and our neighborhood.

Also, with the native grasses, the

Minnesota grasses they're planning to plant underneath the solar panels, this would be a great haven for our pollinators, which would be the butterflies and the bees in the area.

And the area that I'm familiar with is zoned agriculture land. So when we originally started farming the land in this area, there weren't the residents in the area. And I understand their concerns about their homes, but I do also realize that when we started farming, they weren't there. You could look for a ways and not see any homes. And I understand why they want a home out in the agricultural area. I know their concerns are real, but I also think we need to look at the chance of doing something positive for our future and leaving something for our children. We need to be good stewards of the earth. Thank you for your time.

MS. SMETANA: Dennis Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Dennis Anderson,

D-E-N-N-I-S, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. In full disclosure, I

just want to identify myself as the son of two of

the people who have been approached to have their

land leased for the solar farm.

I guess my first question is, and I'm thinking that others may have the same question, for

years whenever there has been an industrial or a commercial plant, they always talk about an Environmental Impact Statement. What is the difference between an EIS and an environmental assessment?

MS. SMETANA: David, take that one.

MR. BIRKHOLZ: Essentially it's the same thing, but in the state, an alternative process has a shorter timeline. So we have a shorter time line to produce the document. And in an EIS there's a provision built in for drafting an EIS and then comments on an EIS and a final, where an EA, the environmental assessment, is a single document. But it is prepared and released before the public hearing so people can comment on it at the public hearing.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you for that explanation.

I was also kind of curious, as some of the people here already mentioned, about the relative location of the North Star site to the Geronimo-Aurora site that is a few months ahead.

I'm thinking does the state -- When they come up with their definitions for what should be included on the various maps that the solar operators need to

prepare, I noticed that that was kind of a glaring omission from the maps that included that locale.

And I was thinking that it might be a nice thing, especially for the public, to see the relative location of both the North Star as well as the Aurora site, since they're kind of in the same business. And as others have said, you know, should this be the place for the concentration of solar sites. I guess I just think that that's something that would be a good element to include in all these maps.

My third comment is, unlike the wind farm generation, where you can still farm around the massive monopods, you don't have that ability here. The land totally goes over to solar and there is no further crop farming.

Now, I guess I can say that that's maybe a plus for some of the houses that are close by, especially on what we call the prairie, because once the grass grows in and you have a nice vegetative cover there that really is never disturbed, I don't think they'll have the springtime dust and wind problem that probably causes them to have to keep their windows closed quite a bit. So I just wanted to say maybe that's one plus for the solar farm as

opposed to crop farming, you won't have as much dust in the air.

But I guess the real gist is that we know that the farmland here is not the most productive farmland in the state, but it is still farmland.

And who knows what lies ahead of us in 25 to 30 years. Will solar still be the thing to do or will there be a new technology that will replace it and the solar will no longer be feasible.

I guess I'm kind of asking for the State to have some sort of assurance built into either regulation or whatever that by the time these 25 to 30 years are up, that crop farming will not all of a sudden become a prohibited activity on this land. In other words, the local municipalities, perhaps having enjoyed the greater tax benefit from the solar on their tax base, will maybe rezone the land away from agriculture into commercial or some other activity that maybe would not be compatible with agriculture.

True, 25, 30 years I may be dead, Gwen
Swenson may be dead, but her sons, Kurt and Carl,
will still be farming. I would hope that they would
be able to farm and not have to look elsewhere for
land that is currently zoned agriculture as opposed

to being zoned to something that prohibits agriculture.

So I don't know if there's any feature in the state legislation or agency regulations, but since it seems like the State is wanting to take the lead on all of the planning and zoning requirements and really not give the local units of government too much say, if they're going to take on that responsibility, then maybe they should also have an assurance out there that when the solar comes to an end, that the land can revert back to its agricultural nature.

And I guess my last comment is, listening to everybody here with their points -- And, really, everybody does have a valid point. I think it's something that all of us just need to keep in mind, is that, you know, are we altruistic and is there a greater good for society as a whole coming because of this solar farm.

True, none of us want to have an eyesore in their backyard. The concern of the electromagnetic fields from EMF, is that really any worse when you're looking at a solar site some distance from a person's home as opposed to EMS emanating from a cell phone that a person is holding

next to their head.

What about the electromagnetic fields from these high voltage power lines that we see adjacent to homes and shopping centers. I'm amazed when I go to Stillwater and see their shopping centers over by Highway 36. You have the big power lines going right through the parking lots and I'm thinking, okay, interesting. You have all the people coming to and fro and nobody seems to care.

So I guess, in conclusion, there's a lot of stuff to take in. And I really don't envy the position of the State staff to have to evaluate this, but it's important that they listen to everybody and figure out, with the best information available to us, what is the best decision not just for the greater good, but also for the people who have to have this in their backyard. There probably is some give and take required on both parties, but I think we need to do something to leave our children and grandchildren better off than perhaps what we are right now. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Richard Daniels.

MR. DANIELS: Thank you. Richard Daniels D-A-N-I-E-L-S, 10132 367th Street. I'm one of the seven houses that live near the donor home

completely surrounded by this project. Had this project been just two or 300 acres to one direction from my house, I would not be here opposed to it.

However, being completely surrounded by these units and not knowing how much heat, how much glare would be coming off of them and how they would affect the resale value of the house, I'm afraid I'm opposed to it. To approve this project, I feel, would not be considered Minnesota nice.

What I'm concerned with basically is the amount of reflection and glare that would be coming off the units during the day as well as how much would be coming off during the evening. We get some clear skies and a full moon with this many units, we could have a considerable amount of evening heat and evening glare. I would have hate to have to spend a lot of money putting blackout shades on all my windows.

And I'm not sure exactly how it would affect the local wildlife. We do have quite a few bald eagles and some of the turkey vultures that fly over this particular area. I'm not sure how it would impact them. It's something that needs to be looked at.

And basically those are the main concerns

I have at this time. I missed the other comments.

I'm sorry for missing out on the other people

speaking. I don't know what they covered, but I had
a county meeting I had to attend. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Thank you.

Vicki Kaz.

MS. KACZMARCZYK: My name is Vicki
Kaczmarczyk, K-A-C-Z-M-A-R-C-Z-Y-K. That's why I go
by Kaz.

I'm an area realtor for RE/MAX in the
Forest Lake. I've been serving this area for over
30 years representing buyers and sellers. And I
heard a couple comments from other people back here.
My job here is to educate the buyers and sellers.

I did not hear about this project until a few months ago. And if I didn't hear about it, I'm sure many others haven't heard about it. It will adversely affect your values on your properties.

The Number 1 consideration when we're doing a market has been and always will be location, location, location. As buyers and sellers, they're going to ask these questions: What are we going to be looking at; what's in our backyard; what's in our front yard. And if we don't tell them if we know, it can come back to haunt you, as sellers and as

buyers. They'll come back and you have liability if you knew something and you didn't tell them.

I don't know how long this is going to be in question; but if you're thinking of selling your homes right now, you have to disclose those things. That's why I'm here, to learn a little bit more so I can help educate buyers and sellers. That's why I'm here.

MS. SMETANA: Kris Anderson.

MS. ANDERSON: Hi. I'm Kristine,

K-R-I-S-T-I-N-E, Anderson, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. I live

at 37206 Keystone Avenue in North Branch. I'm one

of the seven houses that are completely surrounded

by the North Star Energy project.

In response to my neighbor, Mrs. Swenson, who failed to let you know that she also owns property around me, she at some point must have sold the property to the previous owners, who sold it to me three years ago. And it's interesting that they did not sell out all the property around their house.

As for thinking ahead for our children, I see your point, as yours will be collecting yearly checks while mine will have more frequent yearly check-ups.

I would like to add I never received the first letter that was shown up above, nor to date am I a so-called willing participant in this.

There's -- Let me see here. In January of 2015 I was approached by Chase Whitney from Community Solar Energy. Since that time my life has been turned upsidedown. We were in the process of remodeling our house and had already put in \$25,000 into our upper level plus all of our own time, as we were doing this remodel ourselves.

We moved into this home about three years ago and have not stopped doing projects since we moved in to try and update our property. I actually share the same story with many of my neighbors, who have recently invested many tens of thousands of dollars into their homes.

After meeting with Chase Whitney I was told I should hang tight, just put my life on hold, basically, in order to wait and see what happens with the solar project. The thing is, we don't want to hang tight. We have things that we want to do. I have my own life. I have my own projects that need to be done.

I was supposed to be having a wedding at my house this summer. We were supposed to be

putting up a pole barn for my horses right now, as we speak. I was supposed to be landscaping, putting in a patio and planting our field, all of which have been put on hold.

The thing you, the State of Minnesota, you, the Public Utilities Commission, and especially you, Community Solar Energy, have not once thought about or considered is that your -- there are actually lives in the middle of this and around your projects.

In fact, on one of your maps, which Tom showed earlier, we were nothing more than a scribbled out mark. Not only is that insensitive to those that live within the scribbled out mark, but it also shows your intentions. These intentions are not pure, as in good will. If they were, you would also take into consideration that an appraisal price plus a small percentage would not cover replacement costs for our homes.

We do not want to move. None of us had our homes up for sale, nor were we ready to have our homes appraised doing the normal things one would do to upgrade a home, such as painting, updating. And we certainly would not be going off an appraisal the first thing in the spring, before houses start

selling and closing so we would have the comparison. We were perfectly content where we are.

These are not junk homes. These are nice houses in the country, which is why we moved here.

I love my neighbors. Our kids play and we're great friends. We look out for each other.

All of your tactics to get these projects through are rudeness. You have come in here and tried to divide and concur us all as neighbors. You told lies to us about each other saying that we had agreed or disagreed with certain things in order to try to get what you wanted.

Once you had someone -- Once you've get someone to be deceived into signing their rights away, they are not able to talk about anything and are bound by that through a contract in order for Community Solar Energy to be able to get what they want. I'm not only holding the solar companies responsible, but also the State of Minnesota and the Public Utilities Commission.

It is just insane that you all can pass through these projects and mandate all of these things and not have to think about the consequences for the people that pay taxes and vote to put you in the seats that you sit in to make choices for us.

The choices that you are all making for the people who live in and around these projects are careless.

You are not thinking about the future one bit. You are thinking foolishly in the moment.

It's just hurry, hurry, hurry, let's get this all done to make sure we get the best tax credits.

Does anyone remember the last time this country hurried, hurried, hurried into a bunch of decisions that people just made without thinking things through with mortgage companies that just popped up out of the woodwork and wanted to take advantage of tax credit situations. And in this situation that's how it relates.

I would think you would all not have forgotten about the recent recession we were just in. Can you not see that this is a very similar situation, in which the government is putting something out there that has to be done but that should absolutely not be done near people. And all these companies that are popping up out of the woodwork that have not ever done anything of this size, nor have they actually even managed companies, owned homes or had to make decisions that impacted hundreds of lives to date.

Do you really think they are going to be

around when they fail. They aren't even around now with the projects that have already been put up here in Minnesota.

The other day I and another neighbor traveled over to St. Cloud, Minnesota to visit St. John's Solar Garden. It is a solar garden which is on 3.9 acres. I believe the people that put it up would be Aurora, the same ones that are going to do the Aurora-Geronimo project, the next one that they're trying to push through after this one.

I spoke with the neighbors surrounding this solar garden. Not only do the companies tend to forget to maintain these panels, but I would like you to really think about the 440,000 movable metal parts that are out in the middle of 800 acres with motors, all of which go off about once an hour for ten seconds. While going off it sounds like an air compressor filling. I personally witnessed this and could easily hear it.

Along with the fact, you have people trespassing onto your property to ask you questions and gawk at the panels. Now, that was just one set of these things. Are you guys going to guarantee that they are all on the same timer or is there going to be over 800 acres of solar panels that are

offset just a little bit, so now we have to listen to it a steady minute, a steady two minutes or once every other minute. I don't know. Is it going to be a constant noise.

What I do know is that machines fail and that time -- all the time. And who wants to be listening to 800 acres of the air compressors or the squeaking and grinding metal from all the sand that will be getting in them.

Pictures that were represented in here I think are very misinformative (sic) of the local fields. As I can tell, like most of the farmers would be wanting to do something like that because, yes, they don't get as much off their acreage. And guaranteed, there is no grass that is going to grow underneath these things, especially this prairie grass that is even harder to grow than normal grass.

That's just the panels. Now, what about the inverters. Inverters make noise. How much. I don't want to be listening to anything all night long right outside my window in the country, where I can hear nothing but noises of animals and birds, which no longer will be around us.

This brings up another point. We have a lot of wildlife around here, bear, deer, fox,

turkeys, bald eagles, cranes, owls, coyotes, rabbits and, most of all, gophers. What is the plan to take care of all these rodents that now live within this 800 acres of solar panels and have no natural predators to come in and get them, as there is now an eight-foot chain link fence with barbed wire surrounding them. They will not be able to get through unless they dig under the fences.

However, most likely they will not want to come under a magnetic field of power and noise and a reflection in the panels. The reflection from the panels will most likely scare off most animals and birds.

As proof to this I have pictures from the Minnesota -- the one over here in St. John's. The picture I have shows a cloudy day and then of the sun shining. I will pass these around so everyone can see there is a reflection and it is proven right here.

I will also pass around the other picture that show the panels that have no trees put up around them, which is usually, I would say, a mandatory thing that everybody puts forth in their ideas. The follow-through, once again, is not there. Even in the picture showing the professional

landscaping you can see the gaps and the dead -- the trees that are dying in their pictures.

Bottom line, we should not be having this conversation. I should not have to be standing up here pleading my case to protect my family, my investment, my animals, my children, my neighborhood and the people that live in it.

You all should have been responsible and put in place a plan for these companies to have to follow when they come here. These things should not be being put up around homes. Instead of putting the cart before the horse, so to speak, you should have had these things in place and have an accountability plan for them to have to follow, not the so-called checklist of them saying, oh, I met with Mrs. So and So and Mr. So and So and lied to everyone to try and get what I wanted and now it's all backfiring.

I'm a business owner. In fact, up until this last year I had a company in North Branch Industrial Park. Each and every day I have to make decisions that are going to impact the lives of many. If I were as careless in my decision-making as you guys are all being with your business and sworn duties, I would not have a business.

What I don't understand and I think is absolutely ridiculous is if you propose a project big enough, 50 megawatts or more, and it affects and impacts more lives in a community, that community loses control of the decision-making and the processes and procedures by which these companies should have to stick to. You are all trying to sell this as something great, but a project of this magnitude will have huge impacts only our land, community and reputation.

You, the State, have no other concern than to just get your project done and look good.

You, the Community Solar Energy company, want to get the project done and get out of here.

It is not going to look so good when it fails because you have not yet done the research and you push things through, not thinking about repercussions. How is it even acceptable that the community and city that is involved with these projects have no say in what goes on with it.

I want answers. I want accountable answers to my questions. Why do we have a 400-foot setback from wildlife management areas, but we have a 50-foot for human life. That is not acceptable.

I spoke with an electric company today

who goes out and they actually measure the amounts of dirty energy that are put off by the solar panels on people's roofs. Each and every house has dirty energy that has solar panels and people are getting sick.

Solar energy does in fact, which is supported by the documents I will give to you guys, produce dirty energy. It's not the solar panels themselves. It's the inverters, the same inverters used for wind energy. As they chop up the current inverted, it creates high frequency transmits, otherwise known as dirty energy.

The inverters have not come far enough in their technology, either by choice of the manufacturers or because the technology is not there. They cannot handle the amount of energy that is put back into them, which causes them to have this dirty energy and, as a result, it has to go somewhere. In this case it likely goes into the ground.

Proof of this is with the wind power, which has problems with the inverters and low frequency sound, so much so that Brown County, Wisconsin has declared Shirley Wind Farm a public health hazardous. While I know everybody here is

going to try and say that wind and solar is not the same, it has to use the same inverters and the inverters are getting people sick.

It also has been proven 99.9 percent that cattle react to the dirty energy by picking up their feet and lessening production. I have horses, tens of thousands of dollars of horses in my pasture. I now know what will happen when you put 440,000 solar panels in and around them.

I would like testing to be done on all current sites which are even in our state parks, including the St. John's Solar Garden, to prove that there is not any negative environmental effects being produced in and around these so-called gardens and farms, which is really well labeled to try and make it sound much better.

How well does it work and how does it all work. Do you guys even know. Why should we be the lab rats for this idea. These projects should not be next to people. They should be researched far more than what is currently in place before we go slapping solar gardens and farms up around every corner.

Just seeing with the wind stuff, they're shutting down the wind powers. They're producing

too much energy for those inverters. The research has not been done on the solar.

I have children and animals, and I'm not going to just sit back and shut my mouth and let all of you people go on your merry way and collect your checks. I want to see the State of Minnesota, our elected officials and the Public Utilities

Commission put into place action steps for these projects so that they are safe. There needs to be standards.

It is your job to serve and to protect our state. So before you go signing on any dotted line, make sure that this is such a great thing, that it is great for everyone, including the homeowners surrounding these projects, the cities and counties, and the state as a whole.

I want to see a minimum setback of 600 feet from any property line not connected to the project. I would like to see a minimum of four rows of pine trees and a minimum height of eight feet and be maintained at 12 feet. That way they could still collect their solar, but we don't have to look at it.

I want it in writing that these panels are going to be maintained properly and that the

companies involved in maintaining them will have consequences for unsatisfactory maintenance.

I would like to see that any connecting homes to the project would be given a monetary compensation for lost value, to be determined by an unbiased third party. This would be something negotiated before these projects should be approved.

I would like to see that any home completely surrounded by these projects would be bought out, if that is what is desired by the owner, for a reasonable amount, taking into consideration that everyone is in their own unique situation.

This would include replacement cost on a same or similar home and moving costs. Please take into consideration the Otter Tail Power Company, who paid its residents three times their tax assessed value when putting up high wires.

You know, a big thing here, too, is that I'm one of seven houses. It's the first project.

Once that Aurora deal goes in, it encircles I think like nine houses. And there's not just us, it's everybody that's touching it. And like others have said, everybody has to drive by it. We shouldn't have to look at some industrial park in the country. That is not what any of us moved here for.

We moved here for the farm field that Mrs. Swenson and everybody else has. That's what people like. That's what people enjoy. I understand that farming is hard. I get that. But it's going to be much harder when these things fail and they're left behind.

I do not think the things that we are asking are out of line. We already have given up four months of our time researching and looking into homes and trying to figure out what to do. It is now your turn to stand up and do what's right for everyone. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Kory Abell.

MR. ABELL: Kory Abell, K-O-R-Y,
A-B-E-L-L. Hello, everybody. I live on the corner
of 367th Street in Keystone. I am one of the seven
houses surrounded by the solar panel industrial
park.

I have many concerns about this project. Health is always Number 1. With two kids ages six and 11, is this going to affect them. Is there anyone that can show me the facts, the truth that this will not do any harm to them, to me, my family or my neighbors. If so, I would like to see that in writing.

Second, the wildlife. There will be no wildlife left. You can't level off and fence in 800 acres of land and think this will not affect nature.

Here's a little story I have. A couple years ago Christmas morning when we were opening presents, my daughter says, look, look, the reindeer are still here. Out the back patio door three deer stand there. That is gone.

By the time this project goes through, all of the other solar panel companies get to fill up as much farmland as our country, state and city allow them to. We will have over 2,000, think about that, 2,000 fenced off non-usable acres for our wildlife.

Noise. You can't tell me that 440,000 five foot by seven panels on rotating motors moving all day to fill this thing won't make noise, not to mention the inverters converting the power.

I understand the farmers. They can't grow crops on the land they have. I don't blame them. But the little crops they do grow help block the sand from blowing. These panels, all tipped at an angle, are going to funnel the north wind under them and pull up all the sand. The little crops we have are home for the deer and bear, coyotes,

rabbits, pheasants, bald eagles. I can say I have seen all of these in my yard.

The 50-foot setback is not acceptable. A 500 or a thousand foot should be a minimum. How many of you have been sitting at a restaurant when a car pulls up in the parking lot and the sun glares off the windshield into your face. Now imagine 440,000 of these reflecting into your home all day every day for 25 years.

How about the construction process. All the bases will have steel pylons that will have to be hammered into the ground. We are talking hundreds of thousands of these. Hundreds of semis driving up and down our roads.

My road is so narrow it is hard to pass a normal pickup truck, let alone heavy equipment. My five-ton road will be shot by the time this industrial project is to leave.

Another thing that worries me is the company that is doing this project. Why did the next bid come in quite a bit higher than these.

Where are they shortcutting this project. Hopefully not in my backyard or my town. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Daniel Hoffman. Daniel Hoffman. I guess he passes.

1 Justin Baker.

MR. BAKER: Justin Baker, J-U-S-T-I-N, B-A-K-E-R. I'm one of the residents that lives on 367th Street, would be bordered by this project on two sides. I'm not one of the seven homes encompassed by it. But the concerns I have are, first -- And they've mostly been covered, so I just want to be on the record with my concerns.

I do feel -- understand why this is trying to get pushed through quickly and it's for a tax credit. And that makes it financially viable, but that should be part of your assessment.

You, yourself, said that you just don't know I don't know how many times. And this part of the process you're going to figure some of those things out, right? And we haven't had a project this big.

Have you guys done a project this big?
What's the biggest megawatt you've done in one
location to date?

MR. WHITNEY: I think we have to get it on the record. 120 megawatts.

MR. BAKER: In one place. And how many homes did it surround?

MR. WHITNEY: Pueblo, Colorado is one

place and --

MR. BAKER: One place.

MR. WHITNEY: -- Monroe (phonetic) is next to a coal-fired power plant.

MR. BAKER: So you installed it next to a coal-fired power plant, so 120 megawatts?

MR. WHITNEY: 120 megawatts.

MR. BAKER: Okay. It just seems the State of Minnesota has never dealt with this before, but yet we're going to put 800 acres into it right next to us. And they don't even know what this is going to look like, what it's going to be like, what the rules are, what the laws are for it because they've never done it before. And I've heard guinea pig said a couple times, and I'm not comfortable being the guinea pig for this.

Some of the setbacks -- I didn't know about this until I got a letter in the mail a couple weeks ago. I haven't done the research. A couple of my neighbors have. But I just want to be on the record in support of some of their ideas of setbacks of certain footage and limiting our view of it.

Because the first woman that spoke I think was correct in that this is a big asset for the people. This is what we stress -- We drive down

to the metro areas, we run businesses, we stress.

We sweat and we pay for our homes and we pay for our taxes, which those taxes have gone up every year even if our home values have gone down, but we've stuck in here.

We've coached youth programs in our community. We've gone to church. We've been good stewards of this community. We've been good stewards of this state. And we've been good stewards to the environment.

We've improved our homes. We've planted plants in our yards. We've done things to try to improve the value of our neighbors' homes. And this flies in the face of all of that. And you take all of those things away from us and we don't have any power. You guys do. You're our voice. You're the ones that can tell them to make sure that if this is done, it's done fairly and to protect the people that are affected by it.

And for those people that are in support of it, was that an official alternative that

Mr. Carlson gave? Because none of us are prepared to -- They've had this project. They've researched it. They do this for a living. And we're expected as citizens to come up with an alternative site

that's going to be a better site than what a company that does this is supposed to do. That's stacking the deck against the citizens. Is that true, one of our requirements is that we're going to make some ground to give you an alternative site to do this project at? Yeah, that's a question for --

MR. BIRKHOLZ: How did you --

MR. BAKER: One of the parts of this assessment or study was for us to come up with an alternative site for this project to happen?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: When we scope an environmental assessment, it is two things we'll do. We'll look to see if there are additional impacts that are unique to the situation and if there are viable and feasible alternatives to the project.

MR. BAKER: Brought from us. So it's our responsibility to bring to you guys a feasible alternative instead of somebody else?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: In all cases that an alternative has come up, we do not anticipate that people will have the resources of a development company.

MR. BAKER: Right, exactly.

MR. BIRKHOLZ: So as I stated earlier, the things that we do need to know, if we're talking

about alternatives in this case, which is, again, is this a viable project, is the first question. But it's what are the -- What you need to know, what are the problems you're trying to address and how does the new site address them.

And as we talked about, it has to meet standards in this case because, again, in this case it's not like a transmission line. The company that's developing has to be able to do the project. They have to have willing land participants and a sufficient energy source.

MR. BAKER: Okay. Well, I think it's a lot to ask of the citizens, to be able to come up with all of these things. And we hope that you guys take all these considerations and be our ally, be our voice of concern and make sure that if this project goes through, that it's done correctly, that the people are protected and our home values are protected.

I've had realtors come here talking about the value going down. We've had individuals that are surrounded by it that are afraid to have their grandchildren come visit them. This is real stuff.

You guys have a big job to do and I implore you to do it and pump the brakes on this

1 thing. Just because they want a tax credit for it doesn't mean that we, as individuals, have to go on 2 their time line and say, don't worry about all this; 3 let's push it through, make sure they get that tax 4 This should be studied. This should be 5 credit. done judiciously and it should be done not just 6 because they need a tax credit. Thank you. 7 8 MS. SMETANA: Allana Baker. 9 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: She's not here. 10 MS. SMETANA: Susan Swenson. 11 Swenson. 12 MS. SWENSON: I never put myself on the 13 docket. I'm sorry. MS. SMETANA: 14 That's okay. 15 Rochelle Keith. 16 MS. NELSON: Rochelle has stepped out. Is it okay if I take her place? 17 18 MS. SMETANA: Sure. MS. NELSON: My name is Minda Nelson, 19 M-I-N-D-A, last name is N-E-L-S-O-N. 20 So I am actually a student at Anoka-Ramsey Community 21 College. I do not live in the North Branch area. 22 Ι 23 am here on behalf of people in the surrounding 24 communities as well as locations here. 25 My family is all farmers. I'm actually

the seventh generation in Minnesota alone, not to mention countries before we lived here. So I understand the whole agricultural view of things. I've seen the lands change throughout the decades. And I can tell you that my family has had to sell land because of how useless it is getting.

Solar panels and other forms of alternative energy sources are helping our environment because of the future that we are creating for ourselves as a whole. I understand that there are certain homes that are going to be negatively affected by this, but sadly, because of how human beings are spread so widely across the world, no matter where you put alternative energy, it will misplace people. And, sadly, as much as people don't want to be misplaced, some of them may have to do it.

Honestly, if you guys really hate it so much, you can come back to where I live to the west, Princeton. Being misplaced sounds a lot better than having no grandchildren, things like that.

To the gentleman that spoke of EMFs, which is electromagnetic fields, the amount of energy that comes off the solar panels is equivalent to what comes out of your microwave. And the

carcinogens that come from that are actually -- If you put a plastic bowl in your microwave, it's worse for your children than it is coming off the solar panels. It affects maybe 1 percent of people who are already at high risk for cancer.

For people who talked about the noise,

I'm pretty sure that the amount of space you have

out here makes it so that you don't hear your

neighbors carburetors anyway.

To the person that was talking about the non-notification, I understand that there's a lot of times where people don't get every notice. You live out in the middle of nowhere. I understand perfectly well. With that kind of thing, especially when projects are still in the scoping period, there are going to be people that miss out on the information. But this kind of scoping meeting, the fact that you are here means that you are getting the information at some point and you are being heard and your vote is being taken as well.

I am speaking entirely for the solar panels. I do believe that wildlife, in large aspect, may be slightly affected. The grasslands that would be put in underneath this, the shrubbery, things like that, will actually help the environment

in the long run.

I've seen my gardens actually be depleted because the bees are disappearing. Personally, I hate that. I like my bees. So I want grass and things like that near my home. I think the solar panels, with this much acreage put aside, can actually help that.

When it comes to your home values, sadly everything does deplete that. Solar panels are a lot better than a nuclear power plant. I lived in Montgomery, where the nuclear power plant is quite large. I remember in middle school they sent out notes about iodine tablets. Solar panels will never give you that issue, so I believe it is the best alternative energy resource.

When it comes to wildlife, not that much wildlife will be affected by a fence so much as it is by large buildings, which will not be put in.

Because of the closeness of the transformers that are already in place, there won't be accumulating issues to the environment as a whole.

I honestly believe that the solar panels in this area would be the best for the environment as a whole. I want to question, when it comes to costs and things like that, if there's going to be a

monetary value before the end of the process?

That's a question to anybody here. Is there going to be a monetary value to each individual that owns

-- Is that going to be available to people before the end of the process?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: I'm not sure I understand the question entirely, but there will be a monetary value through the property taxes paid to the township and to the county.

MS. NELSON: When it comes to things like the energy resources through Xcel Energy, is there going to be an effect on people's energy bills as a whole?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can't hear.

MS. NELSON: I could just yell. Is it possible that there's going to be any sort of energy bill effects for Xcel Energy users?

MR. SWANSON: My name is Eric Swanson and I work with the Community Energy folks. I worked on the docket that Chase mentioned earlier, where there were bids taken and we were one of the projects selected. And in that docket, and that's all reviewable through the PUC website also, the analysis from a different division of the Department of Commerce was that this project would actually

have net benefits to ratepayers compared to other alternatives.

MS. NELSON: So when it comes to home values, people will be offset and that kind of thing?

MR. SWANSON: I can't speculate on that, I really can't.

MS. NELSON: When it comes to things like alternative energy resources, of course, there's always going to be an argument. Personally, I am only 22 years old, but I have spent my entire high school and college career looking at alternative energy sources. I've lived next to nuclear power plants. I've lived near other energy sources. I've heard transformers right in my backyard. It is very hard for my sisters to go sleep until they get used to trains driving by from coal plants.

I can assure you that solar panels will not be that loud. I can assure you that -- When it comes to the noise, when it comes to the space, people are going to always have a problem with energy resources. We continue to increase the amount of energy that we're using. We're going to have to find a way to allocate such resources. Solar panels are going to be the best bet,

especially in an area such as this, where the wind power is not as high as it is from Kansas.

When we're talking about the solar panels down in Nevada and California, they are actually producing a lot more than what some people would expect up here. At the same time, even though they're not providing as much as one would hope as the maximum value, the ones that are being implemented here are actually going to be slightly higher tech. They're going to actually produce better than the one in Nevada that was mentioned before.

When it comes to looking at the future, looking at your grandchildren's future, I think that a solar panel would be the best sacrifice that you can make right now, especially if your farmland is not as productive as it used to be. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Thank you.

Doug Melby.

MR. MELBY: I'm not a real good public speaker, so I'll --

MS. SMETANA: I need to ask you to come to the mike so the court reporter can see and hear you.

MR. MELBY: All right.

MS. SMETANA: We want to make sure we get what you say.

MR MELBY: I'll try. Yes, it is Doug
Melby, M-E-L-B-Y. I'm one of the residents that's
completely surrounded by this project. I'm not
overly happy about it, but at the same token, it's
got to be in somebody's backyard. It's always
easier to push it into somebody else, but it's in
mine. As long as I'm compensated for it or somehow
taken care of, I guess I really don't care too
greatly.

There is health concerns about it, wildlife concerns, land values, land use, a lot of things to put into play.

Another gentleman offered moving it to another spot. Well, there's always another spot. I think we should just make good with the spot we've got and move forward and try to impact people as small as possible. Definitely take care of the people that are impacted directly, like myself and seven other neighbors and probably more. That's about all I can say.

MR. BIRKHOLZ: People, I appreciate your patience, and I'm not cutting it off here. I'm just saying that I'm interested to hear more comments

that speak towards the scope of the environmental assessment.

I think we've had a fair distribution of people speaking on pro or cons. I think both of those things are being heard here. If people have additional comments to make towards the scope of the environmental assessment, I would appreciate that coming out of this meeting to help us actually do the assessment that needs to be done that certain people have pointed out hasn't been done.

MR. HOCH: Tom Hoch, H-O-C-H. And I'd like to address the fact that somebody mentioned we had an offer, and I'm in the middle, of buying our property. Some of us did get appraisals, but we got a 6 1/2 percent offer, not 20 percent, so I just wanted to clarify that. And one person apparently took that offer, from my knowledge.

MS. SMETANA: Thank you.

MR. HOCH: Thank you.

MR. BIRKHOLZ: And I do want to say there is an additional meeting coming up this fall, a public hearing where you can tell the administrative law judge all of your opinions about what should be done with this project. And that will speak -- that will be open to all of you at that time.

And, again, my hope is to get a good environmental report done to present to that hearing, so you'll have some additional facts at your hand to either help your case -- or not to help your case, but help your understanding or that you can argue at the time and present your findings.

MR. WALTER: John Walter. I have a question on the map. Is this the new boundaries of it?

MR. BIRKHOLZ: No. If you have that map with the handout that I made, the draft scope, that's not the updated boundaries. The updated boundaries have been filed on the E-docket site and on my website. And all it is, is a shift of ten acres inside the project boundary.

MR. WALTER: Well, I've had a map that you sent out probably six months ago, and it shows part of this property line south of County Road 14. This one shows nothing south of County Road 14, so where are we?

MR. WHITNEY: I think the previous map you saw was for part of the Aurora project being developed by Geronimo, which is south of the substation. We are a separate project. It's different.

MR. WALTER: Oh, okay.

MS. SMETANA: Please come forward.

While he's making his way up front, I just want to remind you that you have the opportunity to submit written comments, as well, in any of these formats and the deadline for that is May 15th. Thank you.

MR. WAHLSTROM: Good evening. My name is Peter Wahlstrom, P-E-T-E-R, W-A-H-L-S-T-R-O-M. I live in Fish Lake Township.

So I'd like to address the environmental assessment portion by scoping out first and then looking at it from more of my own personal self-interest. I think that we have to, in matters like this, take into consideration the broader impact that creating energy is having not just on our local communities, but our state, our region, country and even the world.

And as far as I'm concerned, the science is very convincing, it's very clear. We don't have much choice. We are going to have to move into more and more alternative energy sources, renewable energy, clean energy. That's the writing on the wall. We have to go in that direction and we have good incentives in place now to start making those

moves. So when we think about this from a broader perspective, this is really about the future. We have to keep the future in mind.

It's important to also take into consideration present concerns, but we have to weigh them against our needs for the future, and that means the lives of our children and grandchildren, future generations. So this kind of transition is always going to be difficult and sacrifices are going to be required.

From what I hear from the testimony, people are facing, some people directly facing very personally, having to make some sacrifices and that's a tough call for anybody. And I respect their concerns, but this is an issue that's bigger than all of us.

And what I would say is from my
estimation, looking at the science, peer-reviewed
science, not just what pops up on the internet, what
we have with a solar farm is a kind of renewable,
clean energy that is going to have a minimum of
impact on the surroundings. So even though there
may be sacrifices, the sacrifices I think are
minimal, especially when you weigh against the
benefits this brings to the future generations which

we absolutely have to take into account. We don't have a choice anymore.

If I narrow this down, scope it down from my own personal perspective, and largely this involves, you know, effects on property. I live in a rural area. I have a neighbor who has built a huge pole shed right on my property line so I get to see it every day. And in that property -- or in that pole shed he stores big machinery and about a half a dozen motor bikes, which his children use on a regular basis in his own private motocross area.

Now, that's his right to do that and I respect that, but it's a pain. It's really a disturbance to have to deal with not just the sight of that big shed, but the constant roaring of those bikes shattering the peace and quiet and solitude, which I'm sure we all appreciate living in the country. That's the reality that I have to accept.

A former speaker said we live in a world that's becoming more populated and we can't have the ideal circumstances.

So I guess the point I'm trying to make is that the kinds of concerns that are being expressed I think are being addressed with due diligence by the Community Energy Solar

organization. I think that they are really in earnest trying to mitigate these kinds of issues as much as they can. I think that they are sincere when they say that they want to be good neighbors in putting this project in. But they also understand they've got to weigh this against what our energy needs are now and in the future.

So when I think about a project like this, I try to put myself in the shoes of the people, the landowners around this place. And I try to apply the golden rule in the situation, what would I do if I was in their situation.

To be perfectly honest with you, I will say if I were in your situation, I would welcome this project in my backyard. I would welcome this project in my backyard because I believe that it is going to be done with the least amount of negative impact. I would welcome it for this reason as well: Because I want to be responsible for creating -- for contributing to the kind of clean energy future that we absolutely must hand off to our children and our grandchildren. And for that reason alone, I would be willing to make the sacrifice.

In fact, I'd even go so far as to say I wish that this solar farm would be put in where my

neighbor is and you could come out and buy him out, 1 because I would much rather have a solar farm next 2 to me than a big pole shed spewing out fumes and 3 noise all day long. Thank you very much. 4 5 MS. SMETANA: Anyone else who has not had an opportunity to speak yet? 6 7 Yes, sir, come forward. 8 MR. BUTTON: My name is Don Button, 9 D-O-N, B-U-T-T-O-N. I live on 367th Street. Mr. Birkholz, you wish that our comments 10 11 were more directed at environmental impact assessment questions and comments. Is not my home, 12 is not my neighborhood, is not my quality of life an 13 environment? 14 15 MR. BIRKHOLZ: Yes. 16 MR. BUTTON: Thank you. MS. SMETANA: Others who'd like an 17 18 opportunity to speak on the record? Going once --19 Yes, sir. My name is Brad Hunter, 20 MR. HUNTER: 21 B-R-A-D, H-U-N-T-E-R. And the one thing I would 22 like to bring up that no one has brought up tonight 23 is that this solar project is a three-part project. 24 There's two in southern Minnesota and one up here in

25

Chisago County.

Now, I keep hearing how there's

1 1/2 percent of Xcel Energy power has to be produced by the year 2020 I believe. Now, this one was added on I believe solely because of the 30 percent tax credit they will receive.

Now, what they're not telling people and that they're not letting people know is that the two in southern Minnesota are more than enough to fulfill their 1 1/2 percent requirement by the State mandate. So this does not even have to exist for them to fulfill their State needs. I think that's something that needs to be -- let the people know and that's something that needs to be taken into consideration by the Public Utilities Commission in their decision. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Others who would like to speak on the record tonight? Going once --

MR. MADDEN: Michael Madden, M-A-D-D-E-N, North Chisago Lakes. I'm just wondering, the citizen last speaking actually challenged the material basis and, in a sense, questioned whether this was a legitimate proposition that AT&T has signed onto. So I believe Community Energy needs to make a statement, a response to what the last speaker has made, so that we can properly evaluate

the facts on the ground.

MR. BIRKHOLZ: And those facts will definitely be evaluated by a judge and by parties and by a hearing and then, eventually, by the PUC.

But in response directly to your question, yeah, that was heard at a separate PUC Docket Number 14-162. And you can go back to that docket, and anybody who wants can go back to the record and see what's on the record for the decision for the solar portfolio.

MR. MADDEN: I appreciate that very much. There's at least 75 people here who have just been told by an authoritative source, presumably, that the material basis upon which Xcel granted this project to Community Energy is fraudulent. And so there's 75 people here who may not -- who have been told something that you refer us back to a Web page.

MR. BIRKHOLZ: I don't understand.

MR. MADDEN: Community Energy doesn't understand the question. Thank you very much.

MR. SWANSON: Again, Eric Swanson working with Community Energy. And as I understood that comment, it was -- the claim was that the other two projects would be sufficient to fulfill Xcel's portion of the statewide solar energy mandate.

Exactly what percent those two projects alone or those two in combination with our project will fulfill of the mandate depends on a whole lot of assumptions. I don't entirely agree with the statement that was made. I think the record shows that.

What's more important, I think, is that the Public Utilities Commission reviewed all these projects together. Under the analysis of the Department of Commerce that was thoroughly vetted in that record, the three projects combined, by adding them to the Xcel system, the impact to ratepayers is lower than not adding them to the system. That was the basis of the Commission's decision that said we should approve this contract. It wasn't just to fulfill the State energy mandate.

Obviously the docket never would have been opened without the State mandate, that's true, but the decision that was made was one of broader public interest and the Commission's determination was that the analysis showed that these three projects, if approved, would actually be net benefits to ratepayers. And that's what you'll see if you look at the Commission's order in that docket that was referenced. But if people have more

1 questions, I'll be happy to stick around afterwards and talk to you too. 2 MS. SMETANA: Others who would like to 3 speak on the record this evening? Going once, going 4 5 twice, last call. I see no hands. I do want to remind you again the comment 6 7 period closes on May 15th. We welcome -- Or I 8 should say Mr. Birkholz and the Department of 9 Commerce welcome -- We've got a --10 MR. HUNTER: Brad Hunter again. a court reporter. Can the people that were not able 11 to attend access this information and read what 12 13 happened here tonight so they know exactly what was said? 14 15 MS. SMETANA: The answer to that is yes. 16 That information, as soon as it's prepared, will be 17 posted on the Department of Commerce website. 18 MR. HUNTER: Thank you. 19 MS. SMETANA: You're welcome. Okay. So that was our last call. 20 21 One more. Come on forward. 22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: About those taxes, they 23 said that North Star would be paying around

\$350,000, something like that, on the property

But just to tell you a fair deal, Xcel is

24

25

taxes.

one of our best taxpayers in our township. On their substation, which is about -- I think it's maybe about 300 acres, they pay almost a million dollars in property taxes. So if you're talking about good deals, that's a good deal compared to \$300,000 on 800 acres. I don't know who did that math and who does the trading there, but just so you know, Xcel pays their share. Thank you.

MS. SMETANA: Thank you.

Okay. We'll try our final, final call.

Any other hands. Anyone else would like to speak on the record tonight?

Okay. Again, I will remind you the comment period closes May 15th. And with that, I thank you much. As several of the speakers indicated, we will mill about for a while in case you have additional questions you'd like to ask offline. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public scoping and informational meeting concluded at. 8:42 p.m.)